

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating allowance of Claims 25-34, 37, 38, 40-49, 51 and 53-62. Applicants respectfully observe that the Office Action was mistakenly indicated as a Final; Applicants' previous response was an RCE with a Preliminary Amendment. Nevertheless, in a good faith effort to advance prosecution, Applicants respond as follows.

Applicants have amended Claims 33, 35, 36, 39, 44 and 52; Claims 25-49 and 51-62 remain pending. Upon entry of this paper, Applicants respectfully request consideration and allowance of all claims.

Claim 44 was objected to because of an informality. Applicants have amended claim 44 to depend from claim 42 instead of claim 41 to correct the informality. Applicants respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

Claims 35, 36, 39 and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Applicants have amended these claims to correct the informalities the Examiner kindly noted, and as such, respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn. These amendments have not been made in response to any prior art rejection, nor have they been made to distinguish the present invention over any prior art.

Specifically, a review of the claims revealed a typographical error in claim 33. Claim 33 has been amended to add the word "The" as the first word of the claim. Entry is respectfully requested.

Claim 35 has been amended to depend from claim 28 rather than claim 25 to provide further antecedent basis for the limitation "the conductive coating" in claim 28. Moreover, Claim 36 has been amended to remove the language "the arrangement of two or more elements of the circuit board", which is an unnecessary limitation of the claim, and amended to change the limitation "receiver loop" to "filter receiver loop" to address the Examiner's question regarding this limitation. Claim 52 was amended to change the limitation "conductor" to "conductive path" to address the Examiner's question regarding this limitation.

With respect to claim 39, the Examiner indicated that there is no antecedent basis for the term "the external field". This is incorrect. There is sufficient antecedent basis in


the independent claim 25. Since intervening claim 36 is unnecessary to provide antecedent basis, Applicants have amended claim 39 to depend directly from independent claim 25.

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request consideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

Other than the fee for filing of an RCE (see accompanying Request for Continuing Examination paperwork), no additional fee is believed due as a result of this Preliminary Amendment. If, however, Applicants have overlooked the need for any fee due as a result of this Preliminary Amendment, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this Preliminary Amendment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 18, 2006



L. Joy Griebenow
Reg. No. 33,704
Attorney for Applicants

Correspondence to:
L. Joy Griebenow, Esq.
Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
(970) 898-3884